



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which will form the natural subject of an additional article, supplementary to those which we have already published on the See of Peter; and we venture to anticipate that, if we have not altogether failed in our examination of the three great texts relied on by Roman Catholic writers—viz., Matt. xvi., 18, Luke xxii., 31, &c., and John xxi., 15, &c.—we shall not experience much difficulty in satisfactorily disposing of the minor passages now relied on.

As to the last few paragraphs of the above letter, in which, having to *his own* satisfaction disposed of the question of the supremacy of St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles, Dr. G. so trippingly attributes the same powers to the Bishop of Rome over all other bishops, we think we may safely spare ourselves the trouble of discussing them, not only because we have so largely gone into the matter upon former occasions, but because we venture to think that Dr. G. has much more to do before he can safely treat the *preliminary* question of “St. Peter’s supremacy,” as established to the satisfaction of our readers.]

#### CHARGE AGAINST THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN. TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—I had not space enough at the end of my letter of yesterday to express how grieved I am, that at this, the very threshold of our controversy, the Editor of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* should forfeit the credit for sincerity to which, till yesterday, I believed him so well entitled. But here I must tell him, or whosoever he was who answered me in your last number, that with me his credit is gone, till he can offer some excuse for the shift which he used in order to evade the force of a passage\* from St. Cyprian. The shift I allude to is this: He says, first, “We have the high authority of the Benedictine editors to show that Cyprian was not here speaking of St. Peter at all.”<sup>b</sup> Where do the Benedictine editors show this? Now, sir, I must tell you that the credit of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* is at stake till you refer to the *very page* where the Benedictine editors assert that St. Cyprian is not here<sup>c</sup> speaking of St. Peter; or where they make the most distant allusion to what you charge them with. Secondly, my translation of this passage,<sup>d</sup> given *verbatim* at page 34,<sup>e</sup> is suppressed, and hinted at, in page 29, as being incorrect, and as being from the Benedictine edition, when it is from the Oxford edition, which has the word “Petrum,” and which you do not acknowledge.

I must further tell you, that, if you deign to notice and reply to this charge, all recourse to “Launoy and his forty-four fathers” will *HERE* avail you not; for, first, all who read the evangelist agree that Christ built His Church on the “rock,” in Matt. xvi., 18. Secondly, all scholars, whether Protestant or Catholic, agree that St. Cyprian in numerous places tells us that “Christ built His Church on St. Peter;” therefore, thirdly, it is, or should be, agreed by all scholars who are honest enough not to have recourse to artifice that St. Cyprian believed “the rock” mentioned by the evangelist<sup>f</sup> to be St. Peter, and *him alone*. Is it not, then, the height of insincerity to seek to evade the *force of a decisive passage*, where the saint *again reiterates the same doctrine*; and to have the presumption to tell learned Protestants<sup>g</sup> and Catholics that St. Cyprian is not *here* alluding to St. Peter at all? Is this behaving fair and straightforward towards me, who, for the sake of pleasing you, rejected “the authority of the learned Benedictine editors,” and brought against you your own *Oxford edition*? And if by *this* you are already driven to the wall, how would it have been with you now if, from the first, I had turned that “authority” against you, and, instead of replying to your objections against my religion, had put you to defend your own. Lastly, I need not tell you that except you give some excuse, or apology, or explanation for what you have imputed to the Benedictines, &c., our correspondence must cease.

I am, Sir, respectfully yours,  
WILLIAM GERAGHTY.

[We are sorry, but not much surprised, to find Dr. Geraghty so early seeking for an excuse to break off the correspondence which he some months ago voluntarily commenced with us, and that, be it remembered, at a time when he did not, as he himself acknowledges in his supplemental letter of last month (p. 35), give us credit for the amount of *sincerity* which he felt forced to admit and acknowledge his respect for in that letter. We are not surprised, because we can well understand the difficulty in which he must feel himself placed, with respect to the arguments we have brought forward against the supremacy of Rome from his favourite writer, St. Cyprian,

and which, if he had no plausible excuse for not noticing, he would, of course, we presume, feel himself bound to attempt a reply to, which he might not find it so very easy to do. That his indignation is quite causeless, however, in the present instance, we can readily demonstrate, as we are prepared to prove that we used no *shift* or *evasion* or *misrepresentation* whatever in the matter he so angrily and dictatorially complains of.

How does the matter really stand?

The letter which we printed in our January number, p. 9, from Dr. Geraghty, among several other quotations, contained the following passage, ushered in, no doubt, in rather a sneering tone, but which, for the sake of fair and full discussion, we were ready to excuse:—

“You talk as confidently about what the Church of Carthage thought of Rome 1600 years ago as if you had just returned by railroad from consulting it. Indeed, if it thought as its Bishop, St. Cyprian, did (a thing not impossible), these same thoughts will be found to be of that awkward kind which had better be hushed up. For, first, that Church believed that, as ‘there is one God, and one Christ, so there is but one Church, and one chair, by the mouth of Christ, *founded on Peter*.’ (St. Cyprian, epist. 40 pleb. sue.)”

This is *verbatim* the quotation of Dr. Geraghty, and he has himself in a subsequent letter (February number, p. 21) thanked us for the uncommon fidelity with which his letter of January was published.

The reference is plainly to the Benedictine edition, and that alone; for the epistle he quotes is not No. 40 in any other edition than the Benedictine, and he cites it only as epistle 40.

Yet he, in his present letter, asks us in the most taunting and bitter language this behaving “fair and straightforward” toward him who, *for the sake of pleasing us*, rejected the authority of the learned Benedictine editors, &c., &c.

But, then, he asserts that we misrepresent the Benedictine edition, and says the credit of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* is at stake till we refer to the very page.

Be it so. The simple answer is, we have done so already. The edition we used is the Benedictine edition published at Venice in 1758, as we stated at the foot of column 2, page 29; and the page is 132 in that edition, as may be seen in the first note at foot of column 3, same page.

From page 132 of the Benedictine edition we cited the passage, in Latin, which he, Dr. Geraghty, had in his preceding letter purported to cite in English, but cited incorrectly, from the Benedictine edition, whether from the Venetian copy we, of course, cannot tell; but we believe there is no difference except that the notes of Baluze are placed at the foot of each page in the Venetian copy, while they are more prudently placed more out of sight by being relegated to the end of the volume in the Roman copy.

We are so far from thinking the passage at all a *decisive* one, even if Dr. Geraghty’s version had been the true one, that we should have been, in truth, under but little temptation, if ever so dishonestly inclined, to *EVADE* its force by what he calls the “height of insincerity;” for the simple reason which we already stated (p. 29), viz., that as there was no necessary reference in it whatever to Rome, it could not have proved any supremacy in the Church of Rome, but would only have shown that Cyprian was among those fathers who interpreted the 16th Matt., v. 18, of the person and not the *faith* of St. Peter, having, however, no less than 44 fathers of the opposite opinion, as shown in vol. v., p. 135.

The Benedictine editors, however, *deliberately*, and, it will be seen, for good reason (whatever Bishop Fell may have thought, who published his edition many years before, and who, therefore, had not the benefit of their learning to assist him), give the reading, “super petram” (upon a rock), not “super Petrum” (on Peter); and the reason, as we stated, is given in Baluze’s note upon the very words (super petram), viz., that the old editions and 17 ancient codices so render it, and that though Pamphilus had followed Manutius in printing *Petrum*, instead of *petram*, he himself admitted that the latter reading was found in the ancient codices.

We were, therefore, quite justified in our conclusion, which was, we think, a very cautious and candid one, viz., that whether Baluze and the Benedictine editors, or Manutius (and we now add Bishop Fell), were right, is no great matter, as, when there are no less than 17 old MSS. extant giving a different reading, nothing could be more unsafe than to assume as indisputable that St. Cyprian was referring to St. Peter in the passage in question.

As to the argumentative charge that we are dishonest and resort to artifice, because he, Dr. G., is bold enough to assert that “all scholars, whether Protestant or Catholic, agree that St. Cyprian was of opinion that Christ built his Church on St. Peter,” we merely reply that we were dealing *seriatim* with all the passages from St. Cyprian which he (Dr. Geraghty) relied on to prove this very assertion; and that, as each passage relied on in such an examination must be severally dealt with, it was neither “dishonest” nor an “artifice” to show that the words he quoted were at best of doubtful authority; consequently that whatever other passages (passages which we had either already considered, or were pledged to discuss before we have done with St. Cyprian) might prove, this

passage, at least, did not establish any part of Dr. G.’s argument.

We have only to add, though it could not possibly have made the slightest difference in our argument, that we were not at all applying ourselves to Dr. Geraghty’s quotation from St. Cyprian, as cited in his letter, partially given in our March number, p. 34, where we now observe he refers to *both* editions (not solely to the Oxford one, as he now states), but had in our view merely the quotation as given in Dr. G.’s previous letter, which we had not been able to reply to fully, for want of space, in our January number. Though this may not satisfy Dr. G., who appears to be a little more irritable than a calm and candid controversialist ought, in our opinion, to be, we trust it will satisfy our readers that there never was a more groundless or insulting charge than that now made against us, for insincerity, unfairness, evasive shifts, artifice, suppression, and we know not how many more disreputable expedients, to blind Catholics, and mislead Protestants; and though we should be sorry to cut short any thing which Dr. Geraghty may think fit to say in reply to our arguments, or in support of his own, so long as there is any chance of the cause of truth being served by it, we hope he will in future write in a tone less offensive.

The subject on which Dr. Geraghty has thought proper to measure lances with us is the *Supremacy of the Pope*, or, if he prefers it, the *Church of Rome*. If Dr. Geraghty be, as we have no doubt he is, a sincere believer in that doctrine, let him send us an answer to our articles on the *Ancient Churches*, viz., that of Italy in October, 1857, that of Africa, in January, 1858, and of the East, in our present number, and we will gladly publish them, even should they prove that we have *misread* history, or drawn erroneous conclusions from it.]

#### POPE VICTOR AND ST. IRENÆUS.

[The following extract from Dupin, we think, shows how little real power the Bishops of Rome had in the second century. Excommunicating another Church meant merely refusing to hold communion with them, which it was in the power of any Church which disapproved of another to do.]

“Under the pontificate of Victor, the successor of Eleutherius, the controversy that arose between the Asiatic bishops and this pope gave occasion to St. Irenæus to use his utmost endeavours to re-establish peace. The subject of this dispute was to know on what day Easter ought to be observed. The bishops of Asia, according to their ancient custom, always celebrated that festival on the 14th of the moon of March, on whatever day of the week it happened; whereas the Western Churches waited for the Lord’s day before they celebrated it. This difference in point of practice, which seems to be but of little consequence, produced some disturbance among the Churches of the first ages; and when St. Polycarp came to Rome in the time of Pope Anicetus, these two bishops earnestly endeavoured to accommodate this matter, but not being able to persuade one another to leave their former custom (so jealous have Churches always been of their ceremonies and customs), they parted very good friends, thinking that a difference of so little moment ought not to interrupt their mutual agreement. But under the pontificate of Victor this contest was revived with greater heat, and had well nigh caused a division in the Catholic Church; for this pope, incensed because the bishops of Asia, being very far from submitting to the threats and penalties which he had denounced against them, in case they refused to abolish their own custom and to conform to that of the Western Churches, had procured a large epistle to be written to him by Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, in vindication thereof, took a resolution to drive Polycrates and the Asiatic bishops out of their churches, and sent everywhere letters (says Eusebius), in which he declared them to be excommunicated. Whereupon the other bishops, and even those that celebrated the feast of Easter with those of the west, disapproved the proceedings of Victor, and wrote letters to exhort him to take other measures more conformable to peace and charity. But there was none that performed this with greater efficacy than St. Irenæus, who wrote an epistle to him under the name of the Church of France, wherein he declares, that though he himself solemnized the feast of Easter on the Lord’s day, according to his manner, yet he could not approve of his undertaking to excommunicate whole Churches for the observation of a custom which they had received from their ancestors. He advertised him that different customs had been used in Churches, not only in the celebration of the festival of Easter, but also of fasts, and in divers other matters of practice. Lastly, he lays before him that his predecessor did not contend with the Asiatic bishops in this matter; and that St. Polycarp being arrived at Rome, and having Holden a conference with Pope Anicetus touching this affair, they decreed that mutual communion and peace ought not to be broken for a matter of so small importance. It is probable that Victor was convinced by these reasons, for though the Asiatics did not lay aside their custom, yet it doth not appear that the union between them and the Bishops of Rome was thereupon discontinued. This epistle is produced by Eusebius, who affirms that this father wrote many others of the like nature to other bishops.”—Dupin. Eccl. Hist. Vol. i., p. 74, Dublin Ed., 1723.

\* Ad. Pleb. suam.

<sup>b</sup> P. 29. *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, March, 1858.

<sup>c</sup> Where he uses the word “petram.”

<sup>d</sup> “One Church and one chair founded by the mouth of Christ on Peter” (or on a rock).

<sup>e</sup> *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, *ibid.*

<sup>f</sup> If I’m not mistaken; and if I am, correct me, and I will apologise.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. de. Discip. virg., lib. de bono patient., lib. de Unitat. Eccles.

<sup>h</sup> Epist. 55, 70, 71, 73, Ec.

<sup>i</sup> Matt. xvi., 18.

<sup>j</sup> Even Dr. Fell, the learned editor of the Protestant edition of St. Cyprian, if I remember rightly, in his note on this passage, refers it so far to St. Peter as to refer it to his *faith*, which is perfectly fair and honest, and even more than could be expected, seeing that the Council of Trent lays no stress on that distinction between St. Peter and his *faith*, which some *modern* controversialists, for the sake of blinding Catholics to the *main thing*, or his supremacy, have endeavoured to make.